

## **ADMINISTRATIVE PANEL DECISION**

Airbus SAS v. Airbus Aircraft Cleaning, Airbus Aircraft Cleaning  
Case No. D2025-4877

### **1. The Parties**

The Complainant is Airbus SAS, France, represented by CSC Digital Brand Services Group AB, Sweden.

The Respondent is Airbus Aircraft Cleaning, Airbus Aircraft Cleaning, Canada.

### **2. The Domain Name and Registrar**

The disputed domain name <airbusaircraftcleaning.com> is registered with Wix.com Ltd. (the “Registrar”).

### **3. Procedural History**

The Complaint was filed with the WIPO Arbitration and Mediation Center (the “Center”) on November 24, 2025. On November 24, 2025, the Center transmitted by email to the Registrar a request for registrar verification in connection with the disputed domain name. On December 1, 2025, the Registrar transmitted by email to the Center its verification response disclosing registrant and contact information for the disputed domain name which differed from the named Respondent (Registrant Information Redacted) and contact information in the Complaint. The Center sent an email communication to the Complainant on December 1, 2025, providing the registrant and contact information disclosed by the Registrar, and inviting the Complainant to submit an amendment to the Complaint. The Complainant filed an amended Complaint on December 4, 2025.

The Center verified that the Complaint together with the amended Complaint satisfied the formal requirements of the Uniform Domain Name Dispute Resolution Policy (the “Policy” or “UDRP”), the Rules for Uniform Domain Name Dispute Resolution Policy (the “Rules”), and the WIPO Supplemental Rules for Uniform Domain Name Dispute Resolution Policy (the “Supplemental Rules”).

In accordance with the Rules, paragraphs 2 and 4, the Center formally notified the Respondent of the Complaint, and the proceedings commenced on December 9, 2025. In accordance with the Rules, paragraph 5, the due date for Response was December 29, 2025. The Respondent did not submit any response. Accordingly, the Center notified the Respondent’s default on January 6, 2026.

The Center appointed Karen Fong as the sole panelist in this matter on January 13, 2026. The Panel finds that it was properly constituted. The Panel has submitted the Statement of Acceptance and Declaration of Impartiality and Independence, as required by the Center to ensure compliance with the Rules, paragraph 7.

#### **4. Factual Background**

The Complainant and its subsidiaries own trade mark registrations across various jurisdictions for the trade mark AIRBUS. The AIRBUS trade mark was first used in commerce in 1970. The Complainant has designed, manufactured and delivered industry-leading commercial aircraft, helicopters, military transports, satellites and launch vehicles for over 50 years. As of September 2021, the Complainant has delivered over 13,500 aircrafts to airlines worldwide and 12,000 helicopters operated by over 3,000 customers.

The AIRBUS trade mark registrations include the following:

- Canadian Trade Mark Registration No. TMA1127803 for AIRBUS registered on April 29, 2022;
- German Trade Mark Registration No. 302010054700 registered on June 24, 2011; and
- International Trade Mark Registration No. 1112012 registered on June 24, 2011.

(individually and collectively, the “Trade Mark”).

The Complainant’s main website is found at the domain name <airbus.com>. The domain name was registered on May 23, 1995. The Complainant uses the Trade Mark in a particular font and colour wave including dark blue (the “Logo”).

The Respondent which appears to be based in Canada registered the disputed domain name on January 18, 2025. The Respondent’s business name does not appear to be officially registered in Canada’s Business Registries. The disputed domain name resolves to a website which purports to offer cleaning services targeting the Complainant’s AIRBUS aircraft (the “Website”). The Website also features the colour scheme used by the Complainant on its own website and the Trade Mark in a form almost identical to the Logo. The Complainant’s representatives sent a cease and desist letter to the Respondent on March 11, 2025, followed by two reminders. The Respondent did not reply to these letters.

#### **5. Parties’ Contentions**

##### **A. Complainant**

The Complainant contends that it has satisfied each of the elements required under the Policy for a transfer of the disputed domain name.

Notably, the Complainant contends that the disputed domain name is confusingly similar to the Trade Mark, that the Respondent has no rights or legitimate interests with respect to the disputed domain name, and that the disputed domain name was registered and is being used in bad faith. The Complainant requests transfer of the disputed domain name.

##### **B. Respondent**

The Respondent did not reply to the Complainant’s contentions.

#### **6. Discussion and Findings**

##### **A. Identical or Confusingly Similar**

It is well accepted that the first element functions primarily as a standing requirement. The standing (or

threshold) test for confusing similarity involves a reasoned but relatively straightforward comparison between the Complainant's trade mark and the disputed domain name. WIPO Overview of WIPO Panel Views on Selected UDRP Questions, Third Edition ("[WIPO Overview 3.0](#)"), section 1.7.

Based on the available record, the Panel finds the Complainant has shown rights in respect of a trade mark or service mark for the purposes of the Policy. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 1.2.1.

The Panel finds the entirety of the Trade Mark is reproduced within the disputed domain name. Accordingly, the disputed domain name is confusingly similar to the Trade Mark for the purposes of the Policy. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 1.7.

While the addition of the other terms, here "aircraft" and "cleaning", after the Trade Mark in the disputed domain name may bear on assessment of the second and third elements, the Panel finds the addition of such terms does not prevent a finding of confusing similarity between the disputed domain name and the Trade Mark for the purposes of the Policy. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 1.8.

Based on the available record, the Panel finds the first element of the Policy has been established.

## **B. Rights or Legitimate Interests**

Paragraph 4(c) of the Policy provides a list of circumstances in which the Respondent may demonstrate rights or legitimate interests in a disputed domain name.

While the overall burden of proof in UDRP proceedings is on the complainant, panels have recognized that proving a respondent lacks rights or legitimate interests in a domain name may result in the often impossible task of "proving a negative", requiring information that is often primarily within the knowledge or control of the respondent. As such, where a complainant makes out a prima facie case that the respondent lacks rights or legitimate interests, the burden of production on this element shifts to the respondent to come forward with relevant evidence demonstrating rights or legitimate interests in the domain name. If the respondent fails to come forward with such relevant evidence, the complainant is deemed to have satisfied the second element. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 2.1.

Having reviewed the record, the Panel finds the Complainant has established a prima facie case that the Respondent lacks rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name. The Respondent has not rebutted the Complainant's prima facie showing and has not come forward with any relevant evidence demonstrating rights or legitimate interests in the disputed domain name such as those enumerated in the Policy or otherwise.

Moreover, the nature of the disputed domain name is inherently misleading as it effectively impersonates or suggests sponsorship or endorsement by the Complainant. [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 2.5.1. The Respondent's use of "Airbus Aircraft Cleaning" as its name when registering the disputed domain name does not confer any rights or legitimate interests on the Respondent under the circumstances of the case.

Based on the available record, the Panel finds the second element of the Policy has been established.

## **C. Registered and Used in Bad Faith**

The Panel notes that for the purposes of paragraph 4(a)(iii) of the Policy, paragraph 4(b) of the Policy establishes circumstances, in particular but without limitation, that if found by the Panel to be present, shall be evidence of the registration and use of a domain name in bad faith.

In the present case, the Panel notes that the Respondent must have been aware of the Trade Mark when it registered the disputed domain name given the reputation of the Trade Mark, the earlier Trade Mark registrations and the unauthorised use of the Logo on the Website. It is therefore implausible that the Respondent was unaware of the Complainant when it registered the disputed domain name.

In the [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 3.2.2 states as follows:

“Noting the near instantaneous and global reach of the Internet and search engines, and particularly in circumstances where the complainant’s mark is widely known (including in its sector) or highly specific and a respondent cannot credibly claim to have been unaware of the mark (particularly in the case of domainers), panels have been prepared to infer that the respondent knew, or have found that the respondent should have known, that its registration would be identical or confusingly similar to a complainant’s mark. Further factors including the nature of the domain name, the chosen top-level domain, any use of the domain name, or any respondent pattern, may obviate a respondent’s claim not to have been aware of the complainant’s mark.”

The fact that there is a clear absence of rights or legitimate interests coupled with the Respondent’s choice of the disputed domain name without any explanation is also a significant factor to consider (as stated in [WIPO Overview 3.0](#), section 3.2.1). The disputed domain name falls into the category stated above and the Panel finds that registration is in bad faith. The addition of the terms “aircraft” and “cleaning” after the Trade Mark further reflects that the Respondent had the Complainant in mind and was targeting it when registering the disputed domain name.

The disputed domain name is also being used in bad faith. The disputed domain name resolves to a commercial website established for the Respondent’s commercial benefit. The Website prominently displayed the Complainant’s Trade Mark and mimicked the colour scheme of the Complainant’s website and does not contain any prominent and accurate disclaimer disclosing the lack of relationship between the Parties. It is highly likely that Internet users typing the disputed domain name into their browser, or encountering it via a search engine, would be expecting to reach a website operated by, or affiliated with, the Complainant. The disputed domain name is therefore inherently misleading and likely to cause confusion among Internet users, particularly as it incorporates the Complainant’s distinctive Trade Mark and the additional words “aircraft” and “cleaning” directly refer to services that are intrinsically connected with, and necessary for, the operation, maintenance and lifecycle of the Complainant’s products under the Trade Mark.

The Panel finds that the Respondent is seeking to exploit the reputation of the Trade Mark in order to mislead Internet users into visiting the Respondent’s website. On the basis of the record, the Panel concludes that the Respondent has intentionally attempted to attract Internet users for commercial gain by creating a likelihood of confusion as to the source, sponsorship, affiliation, or endorsement of the Website, within the meaning of paragraph 4(b)(iv) of the Policy.

The Panel therefore finds that the disputed domain name has been registered and is being used in bad faith under paragraph 4(b)(iv) of the Policy.

Based on the available record, the Panel finds the third element of the Policy has been established.

## 7. Decision

For the foregoing reasons, in accordance with paragraphs 4(i) of the Policy and 15 of the Rules, the Panel orders that the disputed domain name <airbusaircraftcleaning.com> be transferred to the Complainant.

*/Karen Fong/*

**Karen Fong**

Sole Panelist

Date: February 3, 2026